## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA Alexandria Division

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,	)
Plaintiffs,	)
v.	Civil Action No. 1:23cv0108 (LMB/JFA)
GOOGLE LLC,	)
Defendant.	) ) _)

## **ORDER**

This matter is before the court on defendant's motion to seal filed on June 18, 2025.

(Docket no. 1495). In this motion to seal, defendant seeks leave to file a redacted version of its opposition to plaintiffs' motion to enforce the court's May 30 order and to compel production of Google's remedy feasibility submissions to the European Commission and certain exhibits attached to that opposition. In the memorandum in support of the motion to seal, defendant states that the information it seeks to file under seal contains information protected by the attorney work product doctrine and information containing proprietary and commercially sensitive technical and business information and referencing highly sensitive settlement negotiations. (Docket no. 1496). No other person or entity has filed a response or objection to this motion to seal and the time for doing so has expired.

In the version of its opposition filed in the public record (Docket no. 1493), defendant has redacted certain information on pages 2, 7, 8, 12–15, and 19. Defendant has filed under seal exhibits 1, 3–6, and 9 and a redacted version of exhibit 8. This motion to seal concerns materials submitted to the court for review on a motion to compel and therefore any information to be filed under seal must satisfy the "common law" standard discussed in *Va. Dep't of State Police v.* 

*Wash. Post*, 386 F.3d 567, 575 (4th Cir. 2004). Having reviewed defendant's memorandum in support of its motion to compel and having reviewed the information that has been redacted in the opposition and exhibit 8 and the information in exhibits 1, 3–6 and 9, the court finds that for **the purposes of this motion**, that information may remain under seal at this time. The court notes that much of the information redacted in the opposition and the various exhibits will not remain under seal when the more stringent "First Amendment" standard is applied to this information. For these reasons, it is hereby

ORDERED that the motion to seal is granted and the redacted information contained in pages 2, 7, 8, 12–15, and 19 of the opposition and exhibit 8 shall remain under seal along with exhibits 1, 3–6, and 9.

Entered this 30th day of June, 2025.

John F. Anderson
United States Magistrate Judge
John F. Anderson

United States Magistrate Judge

Alexandria, Virginia